arXiv:1407.3985v1 [math.AP] 15 Jul 2014

AN ELLIPTIC PDE WITH CONVEX SOLUTIONS

JON WARREN

Abstract. Using a mixture of classical and probabilistic techniques we investigate the convexity of solutions to the elliptic pde associated with a certain generalized Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process.

1. Introduction and results

We study solutions to the elliptic partial differential equation

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d}(\delta_{ij}+x_ix_j)\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}=c, \qquad x\in\mathbf{R}^d, \tag{1}$$

c being an arbitrary constant. This equation arose in a probabilitic context, [10], studying d particles moving in a stochastic flow, but with each experiencing an independent Brownian perturbation, The generator of the diffusion describing the motion of this system of particles is the operator, which we will denote by $\mathcal{A}$, appearing on the lefthand side of (1). The purpose of this note is to prove the convexity of certain solutions to (1) used in [10].

We will consider solutions that grow linearly as $|x|\to\infty$ and admit "boundary values"

$$\frac{u(x)}{|x|}\to g(x/|x|) \text{ as } |x|\to\infty \tag{2}$$

where function g defined on the sphere $S^{d-1}=\{x\in\mathbf{R}^d:|x|=1\}$ satisfies $\int g(\theta)d\theta = c/\gamma_d$, where c is the constant appearing on the righthandside of (1), and

$$\gamma_d=\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}}\frac{\Gamma(((d+1)/2)}{\Gamma(d/2)}. \tag{3}$$

We will assume that the dimension $d\geq 2$. Here the integral over the sphere is taken with respect to Lebesgue measure normalised so $\int 1 d\theta = 1$.

Our first result is that the "Dirichlet problem" is solvable for continous boundary data, with convergence to the boundary values occurring uniformly.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $g\in C(S^{d-1})$ and let $c=\gamma_d\int g(\theta)d\theta$ then there exists a unique solution to the p.d.e.* (1)*, with $u(0)=0$ and such that*

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\sup_{\theta\in S^{d-1}}|u(r\theta)/r-g(\theta)|=0.$$

Taking the constant c to be zero, this result looks at first sight as if it might be related to a Martin boundary result for the operator $\mathcal{A}$, But in fact the corresponding diffusion process is recurrent, and the only positive solutions to $\mathcal{A}u=0$ on $\mathbf{R}^d$ are the constant solutions. Thus the Martin boundary consists of a single point at infinity, not a sphere.

It seems plausible that one could transform equation (1) into an elliptic equation on the ball $\Omega=\{x\in\mathbf{R}^d:|x|\leq 1\}$ with g becoming the boundary data on $\partial\Omega$, and then

deduce Theorem 1 from standard results on the Dirichlet boundary problem for such equations, as described in [3]. However if this were to work, then there would have to be some solutioon corresponding to g being identically constant, and no such solution to (1) and (2) with c=0 exists. Instead our strategy for proving Theorem 1 is to take advantage of the spherical symmetry of the opertator $\mathcal{A}$ to write a series expansion for solutions involving speherical harmonic functions. This evidently associates to any function g defined on the sphere the appropriate solution of equation (1). Then the more delicate part of the argument proves the uniform convergence of the solution to the boundary data making use of an appropriate analogue of the maximum principle in the context of linear growth at infinity.

Convexity of the solutions to elliptic partial differential equations has been studied a great deal in the literature, see for example, [5] and [6]. Here we will follow one of the established approaches to proving convexity: making use of the fact the corresponding parabolic equation is convexity preserving. General conditions are known, see [7] and [4] that ensure this. However in our problem we can see directly that the semigroup generated by $\mathcal{A}$ preserves convexity because the associated diffusion process can be extended to a stochastic flow of affine maps. Then to complete the argument for proving the following result we must show convergence of the solution to the parabolic equation to that of the elliptic boundary value problem.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $g \in C(S^{d-1})$ and $u \in C^2(\mathbf{R}^d)$ is the solution to elliptic boundary problem* (1) *and* (2) *with $u(0) = 0$. Then u is convex if and only if $v \in C(\mathbf{R}^d)$ given by*

$$v(x) = |x|g(x/|x|) \quad x \in \mathbf{R}^d,$$

is convex also.

2. Separation of variables and properties of the radial equation

We may rewrite the operator $\mathcal{A}$ in spherical co-ordinates as

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{r^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^2 = \frac{1}{2}(1+r^2)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{(d-1)}{2r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{2r^2}\Delta_{S^{d-1}} = \mathcal{A}_R + \frac{1}{2r^2}\Delta_{S^{d-1}}, \tag{4}$$

where $\Delta_{S^{d-1}}$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator on the sphere S^{d-1}. The evident spherical symmetry suggests a solution by the separation of variables, taking the form

$$u(x) = u(r\theta) = \sum_{l\geq 0} f_l(r)g_l(\theta). \tag{5}$$

Suppose that $g \in L^2(S^{d-1})$ and take g_l to be the projection in $L^2(S^{d-1})$ of g onto the space of spherical harmonic functions of degree l, see [9]. Then g_l satisfies

$$\Delta_{S^{d-1}} g_l = -l(l+d-2)g_l, \tag{6}$$

and consequently for $l \geq 1$, we would like f_l to solve

$$\mathcal{A}_R f_l - \frac{l(l+d-2)}{2r^2} f_l = 0 \tag{7}$$

with $f_l(r)/r \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$ and $f_l(0+) = 0$. In fact such f_l may be expressed in terms of hypergeometric functions, see Lemma 3.

For $l = 0$ we define f_l differently, one reason for this being that non-constant solutions to (7) with $l = 0$ all have a singularity at the origin. Instead we take f_0 to solve

$$\mathcal{A}_R f_0 = \gamma_d \tag{8}$$

with $f_0(r)/r \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$ and $f_0(0+) = 0$. This has a solution

$$f_0(r) = 2\gamma_d \int_0^r \left(\frac{u^2}{1+u^2}\right)^{-(d-1)/2} \int_0^u \frac{v^{d-1}}{(1+v^2)^{(d+1)/2}} dv du \tag{9}$$

which may be verified by simple calculus, noting that

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{v^{d-1}}{(1+v^2)^{(d+1)/2}} dv = \frac{1}{2\gamma_d}.$$

Using Euler's integral representation of the hypergeometric function it is straightforward to check, see Lemma 3, that $f_l(r)$ decays to 0 geometrically fast for r in compact sets as l tends to infinity. On the otherhand, $g_l(\theta)$ grows at most polynomially as l tends to infinity, as can be seen from the integral representation for g_l (page 42, [9]). In conjunction these facts guarantee that the series (5) converges uniformly on compact sets of $\mathbf{R}^d$ and does indeed define a smooth solution to $\mathcal{A}u = c$ except possibly at the origin. But since $\{0\}$ is a polar set for the diffusion associated with $\mathcal{A}$, any bounded solution to $\mathcal{A}u = c$ in the punctured ball $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^d : 0 < |x| < 1\}$ extends to a solution on the entire ball, and so (5) defines a solution on all of $\mathbf{R}^d$.

Lemma 3. *The solution to*

$$\mathcal{A}_R f - \tfrac{l(l+d-2)}{2r^2} f = 0,$$

satisfying boundary conditions $f(0) = 0$ and $f(r)/r \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$ is

$$f(r) = f_l(r) = r^l \frac{\Gamma((l+d+1)/2)\Gamma(l/2)}{\Gamma(l+d/2)\Gamma(1/2)} \, {}_2F_1(l/2, (l-1)/2; l+d/2; -r^2)$$

Moreover for each $R > 0$, there exists $\delta_R \in (0,1)$ so that

$$\sup_{r \le R} f_l(r) \le \delta_R^l \text{ for all sufficiently large } l.$$

Proof. Substituting $f(r) = r^l y(-r^2)$ and $x = -r^2$ into

$$\tfrac{1}{2}(1+r^2)f'' + \tfrac{d-1}{2} f' - \tfrac{l(l+d-2)}{2r^2} f = 0$$

gives

$$x(1-x)y'' + \{l + \tfrac{d}{2} - x(l+\tfrac{1}{2}\}y' - \tfrac{l(l-1)}{4} y = 0,$$

which is the standard form of the hypergeometric equation with parameters $a = l/2$, $b = (l-1)/2$ and $c = l + d/2$. The boundary condition $f(0) = 0$ is satisfied by taking $y(x)$ proportional to ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; x)$. Now to choose the constant of proportionality to get the behaviour as $r \to \infty$ correct we combine Pfaff's transformation with Gauss's formula for ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; 1)$ to deduce that

$$\lim_{x \to -\infty} (1-x)^b \, {}_2F_1(a, b; c; x) = \, {}_2F_1(c-a, b; c; 1) = \frac{\Gamma(c)\Gamma(a-b)}{\Gamma(c-b)\Gamma(a)}.$$

Next using Euler's integral representation for the hypergeometric function

$$f_l(r) = r^l \frac{\Gamma(l/2)}{\Gamma((l-1)/2)\Gamma(1/2)} \int_0^1 t^{(l-3)/2}(1-t)^{(d+l-1)/2}(1+r^2 t)^{-l/2} dt.$$

Now the ratio of gamma functions appearing here grows sublinearly with l, whereas we can estimate the integral as being less than

$$\sup_{0\le t\le 1}\left(\frac{1-t}{1+r^2t}\right)^{l/2} \le \left(\frac{1}{1+r^2}\right)^{l/2}.$$

Consequently the statement of the lemma holds choosing $\delta_R > R/\sqrt{1+R^2}$. □

3. The associated diffusion

Associated with the operator $\mathcal{A}$ is a diffusion and we will make use of this to study solutions of (1). In fact the SDE corresponding to $\mathcal{A}$ is linear, and consequently the diffusion can be constructed explicitly as in the following lemma. Of particular importance is that this representation of the diffusion actually defines a stochastic flow of affine maps of $\mathbf{R}^d$.

Lemma 4. *Let B be a standard one dimensional Brownian motion, and W a standard Browninan motion in $\mathbf{R}^d$. For $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, let*

$$X^x(t) = x\exp\{B(t) - t/2\} + \int_0^t \exp\{(B(t)-B(s)) - (t-s)/2\}dW(s) \tag{10}$$

then $\big(X^x(t); t \ge 0\big)$ is a diffusion with generator $\mathcal{A}$ starting from x.

Proof. This follows by applying Itô's formula to X^x. □

It is easy to see from this lemma that the diffusion is recurrent rather than transient. Indeed we have for every $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$, as $t \to \infty$,

$$X^x(t) = x\exp\{B(t) - t/2\} + \int_0^t \exp\{(B(t)-B(s)) - (t-s)/2\}dW(s) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \tag{11}$$
$$x\exp\{B(t) - t/2\} + \int_0^t \exp\{B(s) - s/2\}dW(s) \stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\to} \int_0^\infty \exp\{B(s) - s/2\}dW(s),$$

where the last stochastic integral is almost surely convergent because its quadratic variation is almost surely finite. It is the fact the associated diffusion is not transient that makes the treatment of the Dirichlet problem for $\mathcal{A}$ somewhat non-standard.

The process X^x defined by (10) is an example of a generalized Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. See [1] for general discussion of these processes and in particular their invariant measures. The particular case of the generalized OU process constructed from two one-dimensional Brownian motions, which corresponds to (10) with $d = 1$, was studied in [11]. There is a close relationship between the generalized OU processes and exponential functionals of Lévy processes, in our case, exponential functionals of Brownian motion. These have been are extensively studied, see the survey article, [8]. In particular we will have need of the folowing observations. The invariant measure given at (11) can be re-written in the form

$$\int_0^\infty \exp\{B(s) - s/2\}dW(s) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} W\big(A_\infty\big) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sqrt{A_\infty}W(1), \tag{12}$$

where A_∞ denotes the exponential functional $\int_0^\infty \exp\{2B(s) - s\}ds$. The distribution of this latter random variable is known to be a stable distribution of index $1/2$, see [2], also Theorem 6.2 of [8], and consequently $\mathbf{E}[A_\infty^{p/2}]$ is finite for $0 < p < 1$ and infinite

if $p = 1$. It follows that if $X(\infty)$ is a $\mathbf{R}^d$ valued random variable whose distribution is the invariant measure at (11), then,

$$\mathbf{E}[|X(\infty)|^p] < \infty \text{ for } p < 1, \text{ and } \mathbf{E}[|X(\infty)|] = \infty. \tag{13}$$

Moreover, the convergence at (11) occurs in L^p for every $p < 1$. On the otherhand for every finite time $t < \infty$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}[|X^x(t)|^2] < \infty. \tag{14}$$

4. Proof of Theorem 1

In order to prove Theorem 1 we must show that the solution u, given by the series (5), has the correct boundary behaviour. If g is a finite linear combination of spherical harmonic functions then this follows immediately from the asymptotic behaviour of f_l. However in general it is more difficult to verify the limit behaviour of u. The key tool we use is the following result which plays the role of a maximum principle in our setting.

Lemma 5. *There exists a constant K such that for every $g \in C(S^{d-1})$ satisfying $\int_{S^{d-1}} g d\theta = 0$ the function u given by (5) and corresponding to g satisfies*

$$|u(x)| \leq K(1 + |x|) \sup_{\theta \in S^{d-1}} |g(\theta)| \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbf{R}^d.$$

Admitting this result we can prove the covergence statement of Theorem 1 as follows. Fix an arbitrary $g \in C(S^{d-1})$. Finite linear combinations of spherical harmonics are dense in $C(S^{d-1})$ by the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, and hence given any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find g_ϵ, a finite linear combination of spherical harmonics, satisfying $\int_{S^{d-1}} g_\epsilon d\theta = \int_{S^{d-1}} g d\theta$ and with

$$||g_\epsilon - g||_\infty \leq \epsilon.$$

But then if u_ϵ is the solution to (1) which corresponds to $g_epsilon$ given by a finite series of the form (5), as we have remarked already,

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \sup_{\theta \in S^{d-1}} |u_\epsilon(r\theta)/r - g_\epsilon(\theta)| = 0.$$

Now $u - u_\epsilon$ corresponds to $g - g_\epsilon$, which has mean 0, and applying the previous lemma to this we obtain

$$|u(x) - u_\epsilon(x)| \leq K\epsilon(1 + |x|),$$

and hence

$$\limsup_{r \to \infty} \sup_{\theta \in S^{d-1}} |u(r\theta)/r - g(\theta)| \leq (K + 1)\epsilon.$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary this proves the desired uniform convergence.

Proof of Lemma 5. We begin by solving the equation $\mathcal{A}_R h = 0$. By elementary means we find that the general solution is a linear combination of a constant and the function

$$h(r) = \int_1^r \left(\frac{1 + u^2}{u^2} \right)^{(d-1)/2} du. \tag{15}$$

Notice that $h(r)/r \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$. Now, for $R > |x| > r$, let

$$\tau_{r,R} = \inf\{t > 0 : X_t^x \notin (r, R)\}.$$

Taking expectations of the martingale $h(|X^x_{t\wedge\tau_{r,R}}|)$, we obtain,

$$\mathbf{P}(|X^x_{\tau_{r,R}}| = R) = \frac{h(|x|) - h(r)}{h(R) - h(r)}. \tag{16}$$

Now note that for each x, $u(x)$ varies continuously with $g \in C(S^{d-1})$. In fact there exist constants K_R so that

$$\sup_{|x|\leq R} |u(x)| \leq K_R \sup_{\theta\in S^{d-1}} |g(\theta)| \tag{17}$$

as can be seen by estimating the terms in the series (5) using Lemma 3. Consequently it is enough to prove the inequality for g belonging to the dense subset consisting of $g \in C(S^{d-1})$ formed of finite linear combinations of spherical harmonics with $\int_{S^{d-1}} g d\theta = 0$. Fix such a g and let u be the corresponding solution of $\mathcal{A}u = 0$. Considering the martingale $u(X^x_{t\wedge\tau_{1,R}})$, where $1 < |x| < R$, we obtain

$$u(x) = \mathbf{E}[u(X^x_{\tau_{1,R}})],$$

whence, using (16),

$$|u(x)| \leq \sup_{|y|=1} |u(y)| + \frac{h(|x|)}{h(R)} \sup_{|y|=R} |u(y)|. \tag{18}$$

Recall that as we have observed previously since u is formed from a finite linear combination of spherical harmonics,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \sup_{\theta\in S^{d-1}} |u(r\theta)/r - g(\theta)| = 0.$$

Consequently, letting $R \to \infty$ in (20) we obtain,

$$|u(x)| \leq \sup_{|y|=1} |u(y)| + h(|x|) \sup_{\theta\in S^{d-1}} |g(\theta)|.$$

Now we apply the estimate (17) to the first of these terms, and we deduce the statement of the lemma holds if K is chosen greater than both $\sup_{r\geq 1} h(r)/r$ and K_1.

□

It remains to prove the uniqueness assertion of the theorem. This we can do adapting the argument just used in the proof of the lemma. Suppose that u_1 and u_2 are two solutions to $\mathcal{A}u = 0$ satisfying

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \sup_{\theta\in S^{d-1}} |u_i(r\theta)/r - g(\theta)| = 0$$

for the same choice of g. Then $u = u_1 - u_2$ solves $\mathcal{A}u = 0$ with

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \sup_{\theta\in S^{d-1}} |u(r\theta)/r| = 0. \tag{19}$$

Considering the martingale $u(X^x_{t\wedge\tau_{r,R}})$ we obtain

$$u(x) = \mathbf{E}[u(X^x_{\tau_{r,R}})],$$

whence, using (16),

$$|u(x)| \leq \sup_{|y|=r} |u(y)| + \frac{h(|x|) - h(r)}{h(R) - h(r)} \sup_{|y|=R} |u(y)|. \tag{20}$$

Now letting $R \to \infty$, holding r fixed, and using (19), gives

$$|u(x)| \leq \sup_{|y|=r} |u(y)|$$

But then letting $r \downarrow 0$ and noting $u(0) = 0$ we deduce u is identically zero.

5. Proof of Theorem 2

We now define the semigroup $(P_t; t \geq 0)$ via $P_t u(x) = \mathbf{E}[u(X^x(t))]$ whenever u is such that the random variable $u(X^x(t))$ is integrable for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$. Recall, in particular, that $\mathbf{E}[|X^x(t)|^2] < \infty$.

Each random map $x \mapsto X^x(t)$ is affine and consequently if u is a convex function then the random function $x \mapsto u(X^x(t))$ is convex with probability one also. Taking expectations we have, for any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $\alpha \in [0,1]$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_t u(\alpha x + (1-\alpha)y) &= \mathbf{E}[u(\alpha X^x(t) + (1-\alpha)X^y(t))] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}[\alpha u(X^x(t)) + (1-\alpha)u(X^y(t))] = \alpha P_t u(x) + (1-\alpha)P_t u(y), \end{aligned}$$

and thus P_t preserves convexity. This will be a key ingredient in the proof of our second theorem. We note in passing that the semigroup of any generalized OU process is convexity preserving.

Our strategy for the proof of Theorem 2 is to study the behaviour of $P_t v$ as $t \to \infty$ where $v(x) = |x| g(x/|x|)$. To begin, first note that the probabilistic analogue of (4) is the skew-product decomposition for the diffusion $(X^x(t); t \geq 0)$:

$$X^x(t) = R^{(r)}(t)\Theta\left(\int_0^t \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2 ds}\right) \tag{21}$$

where $R^{(r)}(t) = |X^x(t)|$ is a diffusion on $(0,\infty)$ with generator $\mathcal{A}_R$ starting from $r = |x| \neq 0$, and $(\Theta(t); t \geq 0)$ a Brownian motion on the sphere S^{d-1} starting from $x/|x|$. An elegant argument for establishing this skew-product is to write $X^x(t)$ as a time change

$$X^x(t) = e^{B(t)-t/2}\hat{W}\left(\int_0^t e^{-2B(s)+s} ds\right) \tag{22}$$

of a d-dimensional Brownian motion $\hat{W}$ satisfying $\hat{W}(0) = x$, and then apply the usual skew-product decomposition of d-dimensional Brownian motion to $\hat{W}$.

Equations (7) and (8) imply that the processes

$$f_l\big(R^{(r)}(t)\big) \exp\left(-\frac{l(l+d-2)}{2}\int_0^t \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2}\right) \tag{23}$$

for $l \geq 1$, and,

$$f_0\big(R^{(r)}(t)\big) - \gamma_d t \tag{24}$$

are local martingales. In fact they are true martingales because f_l' being bounded together with (14) implies their quadratic variations are square integrable.

Now define $f_l(t,r)$ by,

$$f_l(t,r) = \mathbf{E}\left[R^{(r)}(t) \exp\left(-\frac{l(l+d-2)}{2}\int_0^t \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2}\right)\right]. \tag{25}$$

Lemma 6. *For $l \geq 1$ we have for all $r \geq 0$,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} f_l(t,r) = f_l(r).$$

Moreover we have $f_l(r) \leq f_l(t,r) \leq r$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $l \geq 1$. The case $l = 0$ satisfies

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\big(f_0(t,r) - \gamma_d t\big) = f_0(r) + \lambda_d,$$

for all $r \geq 0$, where λ_d is a constant not depending on r.

Proof. Fix $l \geq 1$. Since $f_l(r)/r \to 1$ as $r \to \infty$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a K so that for all $r \geq 0$,

$$(1-\epsilon)f_l(r) - K \leq r \leq (1+\epsilon)f_l(r) + K.$$

Replacing r by $R^{(r)}(t)$, multiplying by $\exp\left(-\frac{l(l+d-2)}{2}\int_0^t \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2}\right)$ and taking expectations, we deduce that

$$(1-\epsilon)f_l(r) - K\delta_l(t,r) \leq f_l(t,r) \leq (1+\epsilon)f_l(r) + K\delta_l(t,r), \tag{26}$$

where $\delta_l(t,r) = \mathbf{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{l(l+d-2)}{2}\int_0^t \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2}\right)\right]$. Now the diffusion $X^x(t)$ being recurrent implies that $\int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2} = \infty$ with probability one, and hence $\delta_l(t,r) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Thus, in (26), if we let $t \to \infty$ and then $\epsilon \downarrow 0$, we deduce that $\lim_{t\to\infty} f_l(t,r) = f_l(r)$ as desired.

For $l \geq 1$ applying Itô's formula to

$$R^{(r)}(t)\exp\left(-\frac{l(l+d-2)}{2}\int_0^t \frac{ds}{R^{(r)}(s)^2}\right)$$

shows this process to a supermartingale, and hence $f_l(t,r)$ is a decreasing function of t. This shows that $f_l(r) \leq f_l(t,r) \leq f_l(0,r) = r$.

Set $\hat{f}_0(r) = r - f_0(r)$. Using (9), it is easy to check that there exists constants A and B so that

$$|\hat{f}_0(r)| \leq A + B\log(1+r). \tag{27}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\big[\hat{f}_0(R^{(r)}(t))\big] &= \mathbf{E}\big[\hat{f}_0(|X^x(t)|)\big] \\
&= \mathbf{E}\left[\hat{f}_0\left(\left|x\exp\{B(t)-t/2\} + \int_0^t \exp\{(B(t)-B(s))-(t-s)/2\}dW(s)\right|\right)\right] \\
&= \mathbf{E}\left[\hat{f}_0\left(\left|x\exp\{B(t)-t/2\} + \int_0^t \exp\{B(s)-s/2\}dW(s)\right|\right)\right] \\
&\to \mathbf{E}\left[\hat{f}_0\left(\left|\int_0^\infty \exp\{B(s)-s/2\}dW(s)\right|\right)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

This convergence of expectations is justified by the uniform integrability of the random variables which follows from the bound (27) and the fact that the fact that the convergence at (11) occurs in L^p for any $0 < p < 1$. Now define the constant λ_d to be the value of the limit at (28), which doesnt depend on r. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_0(t,r) = \mathbf{E}\big[R^{(r)}(t)\big] &= \mathbf{E}\big[f_0(R^{(r)}(t)) + \hat{f}_0(R^{(r)}(t))\big] \\
&= f_0(r) + \gamma_d t + \mathbf{E}\big[\hat{f}_0(R^{(r)}(t))\big] \to f_0(r) + \gamma_d t + \lambda_d.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

□

In the following lemma we establish the convergence of (a shift of) $P_t v$ to the solution u of the elliptic equation. We expect that this convergence to be locally uniform, but its enough for our purposes to prove it in a weaker L^2 sense.

Lemma 7. *Suppose that $g \in C(S^{d-1})$ and let $c = \gamma_d \int g(\theta)d\theta$, and $b = \lambda_d \int g(\theta)d\theta$. Let $v(x) = |x|g(x/|x|)$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and let u be the solution of (1) corresponding to g. Then, as $t \to \infty$,*

$$\int_{S^{d-1}} (P_t v(r\theta) - u(r\theta) - ct - b)^2 d\theta \to 0,$$

for every $r > 0$.

Proof. Letting g_l be the projection of g into the subspace of spherical harmonics of degree l as usual, we claim we can expand $P_t v$ as a series,

$$P_t v(r\theta) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} f_l(t, r) g_l(\theta), \tag{30}$$

with the series converging in $L^2(S^{d-1}(r))$ for each $r > 0$. This convergence is guaranteed by the inequality $0 \le f_l(t, r) \le r$.

To verify the claim that (30) is valid, first note it holds for g that are a finite linear combination of spherical harmonics, by virtue of the skew product (21), the fact that g_l is an eigenfunction of the Laplacian on the sphere, and the definition (25) of $f_l(t, r)$. Now consider, for a fixed $r > 0$ and $t > 0$, the applications,

$$g \in C(S^{d-1}) \mapsto P_t v(r\cdot) \in L^2(S^{d-1}),$$

and

$$g \in C(S^{d-1}) \mapsto \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} f_l(t, r) g_l(\cdot) \in L^2(S^{d-1}).$$

Both are continous (equipping $C(S^{d-1})$ with the uniform norm) and they agree on the dense subspace of finite linear combinations of spherical harmonics. Thus (30) holds for any $g \in C(S^{d-1})$.

With the help of (30) we can now compute, noting $g_0 = \int_{S^{d-1}} g(\theta)d\theta$,

$$\int_{S^{d-1}} (P_t v(r\theta) - u(r\theta) - ct - b)^2 \, d\theta$$
$$= (f_0(t, r)g_0 - f_0(r)g_0 - ct - b)^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} (f_l(t, r) - f_l(r))^2 ||g_l||^2_{S^{d-1}},$$

which tends to 0 as $t \to \infty$ using Lemma 6 and the Dominated Convergence Theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Recall that v being convex implies that $P_t v$ is convex also for every $t \ge 0$. Because L^2 convergence implies almost everywhere convergence along some subsequence, it follows from Lemma 7 that ,for all but a null set of $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$,

$$u(\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y) \le \alpha u(x) + (1 - \alpha)u(y).$$

But u is continuous so this inequality extends to all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

To prove the converse implication, consider arbitrary $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ with $\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y \neq 0$. Then u being conxex implies that, for every $r > 0$,

$$\alpha u(rx) + (1 - \alpha)u(ry) \ge u(\alpha rx + (1 - \alpha)ry).$$

Dividing through by r, and then letting $r \to \infty$, we obtain from (2) that

$$\alpha|x|g(x/|x|) + (1 - \alpha)|y|g(y/|y|) \ge |\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y| g\left(\frac{\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y}{|\alpha x + (1 - \alpha)y|}\right)$$

which in view of the definition of v implies that it is convex.

□

References

[1] P. Carmona, F. Petit and M. Yor, *Exponential functionals of Lévy processes.* In Lévy processes, pp. 41-55. Birkhäuser Boston, (2001).

[2] D.Dufresne, *The distribution of a perpetuity, with applications to risk theory and pension funding.* Scand. Actuarial J. (1990), 39–79.

[3] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer, (2001).

[4] S. Janson and J. Tysk, *Preservation of Convexity of Solutions to Parabolic equations*, Journal of Differential Equations **206**, (2004): 182-226.

[5] B Kawohl, *Rearrangements and Convexity of Level Sets in PDE*, Lecture notes in mathematics, bf 1150, (1985).

[6] N.J. Korevaar, *Convexity properties of solutions to elliptic PDEs*, In Variational Methods for Free Surface Interfaces, 115-121. Springer New York, (1987).

[7] P.L. Lions and M. Musliela, *Convexity of solutions to parabolic equations*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **342** (2006), 215–921.

[8] H. Matsumoto and M. Yor. *Exponential functionals of Brownian motion, I: Probability laws at fixed time.* Probability Surveys **2**, no. 2005 (2005): 312-347.

[9] C. Müller, *Spherical Harmonics*, Lecture notes in mathematics, **17**, (1966).

[10] J.Warren, *Sticky particles and stochastic flows.* In preparation.

[11] M. Yor. *Interpretations in terms of Brownian and Bessel meanders of the distribution of a subordinated perpetuity.* In Lévy Processes, pp. 361-375. Birkhäuser Boston, (2001).

Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK
E-mail address: j.warren@warwick.ac.uk